"Marijana(pronounced maari-yanna) and Dan Gee"
(b) (6)
12/15/2011 07:01 PM

To Eron king

cc Richard Kauffman, Clare Howard, Elizabeth Allen, "esseneinfo@aol.com Owen", ffeldstein, Gary Hale, "jae.p.douglas@state.or.us DOUGLAS", BISHOP Karen, "keo1@cdc.gov (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB) Orloff"

bcc

Subject Re: Note from Clare Howard, NOW COMMENTS from D/M Gee

Greetings to all,

1.In winter of 2011 over 30 of our community members' urine,including ours tested positive for Atrazine and 2,4-D . In Spring of 2011 urine of our family showed up positive for 2,4-D and Atrazine,AGAIN ! (through Dr. Danna Barr testing).
In late summer of August 2011 our urine tested positive for 2,4-D AGAIN! (through OHA testing).
THIS IS INDICATING A CHRONIC LOW LEVEL EXPOSURE !
NOTE: THIS IS ONLY FOR 2011,AND ONLY TWO MAIN PESTICIDES ARE TESTED!

It is logical that due to the obviously known source of our exposure to presume that this is a year after year recurrence.
Our questions for this column are:
A. WAS THE CONTROL GROUP (NHANES) TESTED IN SUMMER, SPRING,FALL OR WINTER ?
B. OR WHERE THEY TESTED IN ALL SEASONS?
C. In your report ,Mr.Kenneth Orloff you wrote that our levels "are below the concentrations that would be expected to cause adverse health effects". CAN YOU PLEASE POINT US TO THE STUDY THAT PROVES THE FINDINGS THAT YOU STATED TO ALL OF THE PARTICIPANTS?
ALSO, CAN YOU PLEASE POINT US TO THE STUDY THAT CAN SUPPORT YOUR TEST REPORT STATEMENT IN THE LIGHT OF THE TRUTH THAT THIS CHEMICAL IS NOT THE ONLY CHEMICAL IN THE MIX OF PESTICIDES USED THAT HAS ENCROACHED INTO OUR BODIES ?
SO, PLEASE POINT US TO THE STUDY THAT PROVES THE SAFETY OF 2,4-D IN THE CONSTANT LOW LEVEL SYNERGISTIC EFFECT WITH OTHER PESTICIDES SPRAYED ON THE HILLS AROUND OUR COMMUNITIES IN OR?

D. It has also come to our attention from the scientists that are reviewing your protocol that the temperature the urine samples were stored at was way less than optimal: "Disturbing item in the QAPP which was that samples and extractions appear to be recommended to be stored at 4° C [pp. 19-21]. This temperature is inappropriate for vouchers since they will quickly degrade at this temperature if unprotected. They should be stored at -70° C maximum - even -20° C storage in an 'ordinary' freezer still allows enzymatic chemical conversions to occur at measurable rates. Notice also that these are "Data Quality Objectives" and not "Data Quality Guarantees".

QUESTION:
WHY WERE THE TESTS STORED AT 4° C,RATHER THAN -70° C MAXIMUM - EVEN -20° C ???

E. It has come to our attention that OHA's David Farrer and Dr. Mathew Dubrow have been asked by community members "where do they think the exposure is occurring" and are pointing to the sources of everything BUT THE VERY HILLS SOAKED IN THIS AND OTHER PESTICIDES!?
WHY????
This is very disrespectful to the intelligence of people that have been personally effected by these sprays and ARE VERY AWARE and do know the source!
It is also disrespectful to the ones that are now starting to find a correlation to their cancers,aches and pains,diabetes,Parkinson's, miscarriages,etc,etc. and were previously clueless to that correlation.
We want you to know that even several community members that were using these pesticides,and thought that they were safe ,after discovering that they now have cancer are starting to do their own research,and are finding that many respected scientists,especially the ones that are not financially tied to the Chemical Industry have already shown the studies of the correlation.
THE POINT HERE IS THAT THERE IS NO RUNNING AWAY FROM TRUTH,AND EVERYONE THAT IS NOW GIVEN A CHANCE TO STAND UP FOR THAT TRUTH SHOULD TAKE THAT OPPORTUNITY!
FOR THE DECEPTION AND DESTRUCTIVE QUALITIES OF THE POLITICS INVOLVED IN THIS POLLUTION AND HEALTH DEGRADATIONS MUST CONSUME IT'S SELF!
I am not speaking to anyone here personally,but to the force behind this corrupt system,and to the ones that choose to feed it by allowing any wrong activities to continue!
2.
WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR OPENNESS TO THE INFORMATION AND RESEARCH DONE BY SCIENTISTS THAT HAVE STEPPED OUT OF THE "SYSTEM" RUN BY THE CORPORATE AGENDAS !
When your agencies are getting pressured by the ignorance of the very polluters ,we ask you to ask yourselves:" how are my actions effecting lives of others?" " how will my actions effect me in the future ? "how am I responsible?" " how do I stand up for the truth"
There needs to be a letter to all the participants that OHA fact sheets were not the same as the independent study fact sheets,and we request that you allow us to submit to you the data for your review to be sent to ALL PARTICIPANTS.
THESE ARE ALL CREDIBLE STUDIES,AND SHOW DIFFERENT FACTS THAN THOSE THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN/ PRESENTED AT THE OHA OPEN HOUSE.
A.
WILL YOU ACCEPT CREDIBLE RESEARCH DATA OTHER THAN CORPORATE,AND DISTRIBUTE IT AS WELL, NOW THAT YOU HAVE ALREADY DISTRIBUTED THE CORPORATE 'FACT" SHEETS THAT DO NOT SEAM TO SEE ANY HEALTH PROBLEMS RELATED TO THEIR POISONS?
WILL YOU SEND THE COUNTERING CREDIBLE DATA WE PROVIDE from our

research TO THE PUBLIC?

3.
I am professionally trained in the ancient health diagnoses through the Chinese Medicine of nail,tongue,skin and eyes.
This system of diagnosing is over 5,000 years old and has been proven more advanced than modern technology in the light of it's ability to diagnose early stages of the disease .
In over 40 years of experience and research ,my mentor ,Dr .Chi has been able to pre-diagnose modern diseases many years in advance ,at their developmental stages.I was certified and trained in this ancient art and have observed the necessary markers in many families of our community.
We have found that many families ,including children have shown to exhibit the markers of an early progress of disease ,long before the clinical tests will be able to show and diagnose.
For an instance ,there are certain physical markers of bad estrogen,or xenoetrogens.

But before I go ahead and explain some of those physical markers ,let me briefly explain what xenoestrogens are.

Xenoestrogens,also called environmental hormones or endocrine disrupting chemicals , and are substances that mimic the effects of estrogen.
They attach to the receptors and disrupt endocrine functions! Common xenoestrogens are PESTICIDES!

CONSTANT LOW DOSAGE EXPOSURE to XENOESTROGENS can cause damage to the reproductive system and other organs and lead to cancer!
In man it can reduce the sperm count,has feminizing qualities, increases the risk of testicular cancer (which by the way has been shown elevated in our community!),and are predominant precursors of prostate cancer.In woman it causes the early puberty,increases the risk of breast cancer.It also causes hormonal imbalance,gaining of weight and difficulty managing weight,uterine fibroids,ovarian cyst,fybrocystic breasts.
High Bad Estrogen and Low Testosterone are also related to diabetes and insulin resistance.
There are many studies already linking elevated mimicking estrogen from the environmental source (pesticides) and cardiovascular risk in both men and women.
Those who have elevated levels have increased risk for blood cloths,arteriosclerosis,heart attack!
No wonder why one of our community members who used to spray RoundUp comments that he had multiple symptoms of heart attacks.His wife ,after his decades of spraying now has cancer!

Recent studies indicate that a high level of bad estrogen has pro -inflammatory effects and thus can increase damage to the blood vessels and increase the chance for stroke! (Gary, this is what Jan ,your wife,our dear friend was a victim of this year!,and what many others

are dealing with due to the negligence and bureaucracy that needs to be eliminated forever!)

Going back to some of the physical markers that according to the Nail ,Tongue and Eye Chinese Medicine Diagnoses can show the early progress of the disease and the exposure to the xenoestrogens:
1.Red dots on the tongue
2. Cherry angiomas (little red dots) on the abdomen ,face and other parts of the body (chest,etc).
3.White spots on the nails
4.Facial hyperpigmentation
5.Exposed blood vessels in the eyes
These are just some common markers that often appear early in the progress of disease and long before clinical tests will show estrogen dominance.
Again we have found these markers on MANY in our community members observed ,including children!
We are also aware of many still born,deformed children and recently have found out about several stunted growth children in our community,as well ADHD and behavioral problems,etc.
There has been many miscarriages in our community as well early puberty,brain tumors ,cancers ,etc.
We are not going to go into details of our own health experiences here,but are documenting everything as much as all the other community groups are doing now so we heard!
It is very obvious that this community and others are not standing for this ignorance and that denial of the correlation to our chronic exposure to these pesticides must cease !
Here is the link to the article on the behavioral effects of the Xenoestrogens.
by Prof Giancarlo Panzica
University of Torino : http://www.scitopics.com/Behavioral_effects_of_Xenoestrogens.html

When one understands the magnitude of suffering these substances cause one must face the responsibility to eliminate self destructive substances from their use,and as Eron said in the below e mail everyone needs to stand up sooner or later ,for lies can only live so long!
Humans are the only species that self destruct ,yet call themselves intelligent?
Humans that are knowingly or ignorantly feeding the destructiveness in any way must realize that the actions they are taking through their own will can only come back to the it's source!
Looking at the information test report conclusions,fact sheets given to the public ,so far this study has not served the public truthfully and it has not encompassed independent ,non corporate scientific facts!
THIS CAN STILL CHANGE,BUT IF IT DOES NOT IT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED BY WHAT OUR RESEARCH ,EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN TO US TO BE TRUE!

THIS BELOW IS VERY IMPORTANT INFORMATION TO CONSIDER IN REGARDS TO LOW LEVEL ,CHRONIC EXPOSURE TO THE XENOESTROGENS IN THE ENVIRONMENT:

Invasion of the Endocrine Disruptors

Are tiny amounts of manmade chemicals having a big effect on human beings? UTMB professor Cheryl Watson thinks she's found how they might be.

By Jim Kelly

The first time UTMB professor Cheryl Watson heard of the endocrine disruptor hypothesis, she says, “I thought, now there’s a scary idea.” This was in the early 1980s, and the scary idea was that chemicals in the environment might interfere with the vital hormonal signaling networks that govern animal and human reproduction, development, and behavior.

A small but growing group of wildlife biologists, environmental toxicologists, cancer researchers, and specialists in developmental disorders suggested such interference could be causing a host of problems that recently seemed to have emerged in both animals and humans. Endocrine disruption caused by pollution, they said, was the best explanation for why certain populations of birds near the Great Lakes had mysteriously become unable to produce viable eggs, or in some cases had become completely uninterested in courtship and mating. It might also explain the sudden appearance in England of fish possessing both male and female sex characteristics, and male alligators in a Florida lake with sex organs one-third to one-half normal size. In humans, some asserted, exposure to endocrine disruptors before or just after birth could account for an apparent decline in the average quantity and quality of sperm, as well as an increase in the rates of breast, prostate, and testicular cancer.

We knew that animals were being affected,” Watson says. “You had these classic cases of DDT causing thin-shelled bird eggs and alligators in Lake Apopka in Florida having very small reproductive organs, things like that.” There was no reason, she remembers thinking, to assume that humans were immune to these effects.

And yet, many scientists seemed to be doing just that. Their strongest arguments centered on the lack of an explanation for how the very low doses of endocrine-disrupting chemicals to which most people were exposed could produce any effect at all. Take the largest group of endocrine disruptors, the so-called “estrogen mimics” or “xenoestrogens,” which included such notoriously toxic substances as DDT, dioxins, and PCBs. Certainly they seemed to be able to imitate the body’s own dominant estrogen, estradiol, in some ways—they could make breast cancer cells grow. But at realistic exposure levels they barely triggered any response at all in experiments designed to measure traditional mechanisms of hormone action. They were, at worst, thought to be “weakly estrogenic.”

It was a messy question, and not just scientifically. The issue had become politically controversial as well, as environmentalists and breast-cancer activists called for tighter regulation of dozens of economically important manmade chemicals known to have estrogenic activity—everything from pesticides and herbicides to widely used detergents and plastics.

Some researchers might have just shrugged their shoulders and walked away. But Watson had a different reaction. “I always had a kind of curiosity about how we could see these effects in animals, and yet when we tested mechanistically in the laboratory, we didn’t see any effects,” she says. That curiosity combined with something else—years spent on the leading edge of estrogen signaling research — to produce an idea. Experiments conducted with her frequent collaborator Bahiru Gametchu had convinced her that steroids could act on cells through a “non-traditional pathway,” one that at the time was not yet accepted by the majority of steroid signaling specialists and virtually was unknown outside the field. If a natural estrogen could trigger this mechanism, she reasoned, then it was possible that xenoestrogens could do the same thing. And if she could measure that effect, it might be possible to begin to determine the true threat these chemicals posed.

Now—after years of fine-tuning experiments, struggling against entrenched ideas about how hormones work and submitting and re-submitting papers to journal after journal—she believes she’s succeeded.

To Watson, the results she and her team have produced seem both exciting and deeply disturbing. Watson’s data, published in the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences-sponsored journal *Environmental Health Perspectives* , suggest that xenoestrogens can act at concentrations almost too small to imagine, plugging themselves into cellular circuits that biologists are only beginning to understand. “We see xenoestrogens causing the same type of responses that physiological estrogens can, triggering responses at the same low doses for the most part,” Watson says. “They’re doing them in a different timing pattern, but they’re still just as potent. The literature says they’re weak estrogens, and they don’t do anything unless you use high concentrations of them, and we’re saying that’s not true.”

The literature says they’re weak estrogens, and they don’t do anything unless you use high concentrations of them, and we’re saying that’s not true.”

Watson’s journey to uncover a new signaling mechanism for xenoestrogens began with a colleague’s mistake—the kind of serendipitous stumble so often recounted in tales of scientific discovery. That colleague was Gametchu, an immunologist, who in the late 1980s was pushing the limits of the then-new technology of fluorescent antibody labeling. These antibody “fluorescent tags” were designed to attach to only one kind of molecule. Once they got into a cell, examination with a microscope would show exactly where those molecules—in this case glucocorticoid receptors, important players in leukemia therapy—were located. Antibodies are not small enough to slip through a cell’s membrane on their own, so Gametchu had to use a detergent to “punch holes” in his cells to get the fluorescent antibodies in. One day, Watson remembers, Gametchu forgot to use the detergent. By the time he realized his mistake, he was so close to the end of the experiment that he decided to go ahead and take a look through the microscope anyway.

What he saw surprised him—and it surprised Watson, too, when he invited her to come down the hall and look a few minutes later. “It was really weird,” she remembers. “He was trying to determine if the receptor was in the cell nucleus or in the cytoplasm. You would expect to see

either a cell with the nucleus all lit up or a cell with an empty nucleus and the cytoplasm all lit up. What I saw was a cell with glowing polka dots all over its surface."

Both the glucocorticoid and the estrogen signaling molecules that Gametchu and Watson studied were classified as steroid hormones. According to current theory, that meant they slid straight through the plasma membrane surrounding a cell to dock with glucocorticoid and estrogen receptor molecules inside the cell—the only place, according to the conventional wisdom of the time, that such receptors existed. And yet, now Gametchu seemed to have found glucocorticoid receptors on the cell's outside.

Talking it over with Gametchu a few days later, Watson remembered hearing about a Stanford researcher named Clara Szego who had published data in the 1970s that seemed to show that steroid hormone receptors— estrogen receptors, in fact—existed on the outer membranes of cells. Szego's claims had been widely disputed, but now it looked as if she might have been right.

Immediately, Watson began thinking about how she might do antibody experiments to look for estrogen receptors on the cell membrane. Estrogen signaling was known to play a critical part in the genesis of breast cancer, and estrogen receptors on the cell membrane might act differently from those inside the cell, activating previously unsuspected biochemical circuits. If they could be found, membrane estrogen receptors could help supply a major piece of the breast-cancer puzzle.

For the next five years, with the help of Gametchu and graduate student Todd Pappas, Watson worked to develop a technique that would enable her to use antibodies to see membrane estrogen receptors. The system she settled on employed a line of rat pituitary gland tumor cells known to respond quickly to estrogen, and a custom-made antibody to the estrogen receptor. (Estrogen receptor antibodies were just beginning to be commercially available, but were prohibitively expensive because they were being marketed for breast-cancer clinical diagnosis, not research.) At the end of a long, difficult process of trial and error, she succeeded: "Using our antibody to the estrogen receptor, we saw essentially the same thing that we had seen with the membrane glucocorticoid receptors."

Seeing estrogen receptors on the membrane was a great achievement, but getting other people to see them, too, turned out to be much harder than Watson had anticipated. The orthodox view that steroid hormone receptors were found only inside cells was strongly held by the researchers who reviewed articles on this subject for scientific journals. "We spent a lot of energy in the first few years of this effort submitting papers over and over again, re-writing and re-submitting—papers typically would take four and five different submissions to different journals before we could get them accepted," Watson says.

But in 1995, they managed to break through with a paper in FASEB Journal, a widely respected and read scientific publication. Around the same time, Watson published a paper titled "The Other Estrogen Receptor in the Plasma Membrane: Implications for the Actions of Environmental Estrogens" in Environmental Health Perspectives. ("Environmental estrogens" is a term used for xenoestrogens or estrogen mimics that are environmental contaminants.) In that

paper, Watson described her group's finding that estradiol could interact with membrane estrogen receptors and within minutes trigger inflows of calcium ions that led to the release of large quantities of prolactin, a powerful reproductive hormone whose wide range of effects included the promotion of lactation and maternal behavior.

The speed of this response meant that it had to be what researchers called "non-genomic" or "non-nuclear"—that is, it had to be happening through a different mechanism than the relatively slow process by which scientists had traditionally thought hormones worked. That pathway required the involvement of DNA (the genome, thus—"genomic") and RNA in the cell's nucleus to produce new proteins like prolactin, and it took hours or even days, not minutes. The implication was that if membrane estrogen receptors could respond to estradiol in such a rapid, unexpected fashion, they might be doing something similar in response to xenoestrogens—and doing it so much faster that scientists weren't catching it.

"People were so wed to the idea of a genomic response, and when you're looking at genomic responses you usually don't check until twenty-four or forty-eight hours, when you're sure you can get a good signal," Watson says. "Well, you could be completely missing a whole mechanism because you chose time points that didn't let you see it."

If researchers were "missing a whole mechanism," Watson recognized, it could shed light on why they'd had so much trouble explaining the apparent xenoestrogen effects observed in wildlife—and, increasingly, in laboratory animals—with test-tube experiments on cells. Those experiments had been designed to detect genomic responses, and they all seemed to show that xenoestrogens only produced such effects at very high concentrations, a thousand or even ten thousand times as high as estradiol. "People look at that and say, that's a lot," Watson says. "What are we worried about? Even if a chemical company spills a lot of this stuff it gets quickly diluted below that level. Very rarely would you ever have that kind of quantity around." But if, like estradiol, xenoestrogens could also work through a membrane receptor, who knew how little might be needed to produce a significant response?

Watson had a hunch the answer would be interesting, and so in 2001 she and postdoctoral researcher Nataliya Bulayeva began developing a series of experiments to look at the responses of rat pituitary tumor cells to a number of known xenoestrogens.

The chemicals studied included pesticides (endosulfan and dieldrin) and their breakdown products (DDE, for example, produced when DDT is metabolized); coumestrol, a xenoestrogen produced by plants and found in alfalfa sprouts and sunflower seeds; and two compounds widely used to make plastics, nonylphenol and bisphenol A. They also tested DES, a synthetic estrogen that had been given to pregnant women from 1940 to the early 1970s in the mistaken belief that it prevented miscarriages. In fact, researchers later found that the daughters of women who had taken DES during pregnancy faced a far greater risk of a rare type of vaginal cancer and malformations of the reproductive tract.

"Our method is more convenient—it gives you more data faster, and that's the point, the power of numbers,"

Primarily carried out by Bulayeva and research assistant Ann Wozniak, the lab work focused on detecting whether exposure to the different xenoestrogens caused rapid responses in calcium inflow and prolactin release; it also compared the level and time course of any responses to those induced by estradiol. It aimed as well to measure changes in extracellular-regulated kinases (ERKs), enzymes inside the cell that were known to participate in many different signaling processes—some of which led to quick non-genomic responses and others of which influenced complicated processes like cell division.

ERK measurements had been done before, but Bulayeva had adapted a more efficient and precise mechanized process that enabled her to rapidly and accurately scan large numbers of cell preparations. “Our method is more convenient—it gives you more data faster, and that’s the point, the power of numbers,” Bulayeva says. Still, “faster” is a relative term when one is testing the effects of varying concentrations of multiple chemicals at exposure times ranging from three to thirty minutes. Once the ERK analysis system was ready, it took more than six months for Bulayeva to gather the needed data.

The results of the ERK studies and the calcium and prolactin experiments, though, looked like they were worth the wait. “We looked at these data and said these things are just as potent as physiological estrogens like estradiol if you look at these mechanisms,” Watson says.

Take bisphenol A, for example. The chemical is a near-ubiquitous component of the polycarbonate plastics used to make beverage bottles and other food packaging, and it easily leaches into its surroundings, making exposure virtually impossible to avoid; a 2005 Centers for Disease Control study examining American urine samples found that 95 percent contained measurable levels of bisphenol A. The Watson lab’s results showed that cells exposed to less than one part per trillion concentrations of bisphenol A doubled their prolactin output.

Watson’s work was cited in two recent papers by bisphenol A expert Frederick vom Saal of the University of Missouri. One, published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, described prostate gland abnormalities found in male mouse fetuses whose mothers had been fed doses of bisphenol A lower than those normally consumed by pregnant women. The other, a commentary published in Environmental Health Perspectives, reviewed the latest test-tube, animal, and epidemiological studies of the low-dose effects of bisphenol A, noted significant differences in results produced by industry- and government-sponsored research, and called on the EPA to re-assess the risks posed by the chemical.

Other data from the Watson group were almost as disturbing. They showed prolactin output activity equal to that prompted by the human hormone estradiol at levels below one part per billion of the pesticide endosulfan and the DDT breakdown product DDE. And all the xenoestrogens tested—except bisphenol A—appeared to be causing strong ERK activation within a matter of minutes at very low concentrations.

“People thought they could ignore such low levels, that in real life unless you bathe in this stuff you don’t have to worry about it,” Watson says. “There are hundreds of articles over the last ten years or so, all saying that you need micromolar quantities of these compounds to get a reaction

through the nuclear estrogen receptor gene expression route, and now we come along and say we've got nanomolar responses—responses at concentrations a thousand times lower. Well, at the last meeting when I presented this it got people's attention. They went yikes!"

The Watson group's results had implications that went beyond simple shock value. One of the most profound was the way their unusually detailed data showed the paradoxical responses of living things to different levels of xenoestrogens at different points in time. When it comes to endocrine signaling effects, the toxicological truism that "the dose makes the poison"—the greater the level of a toxic substance, the greater the response—has recently come to be seen as too simplistic. Reactions to low doses of hormones or hormone mimics can be much greater than reactions to high doses, and such reactions do not simply increase or decrease in a simple fashion over time.

"Here's the estradiol ERK response," Watson says, sketching a curve in purple ink on a piece of scrap paper. "Here's the response in this case to a phytoestrogen, a plant estrogen. Now they both do the trick, but look at the complete difference in phasing." The two curves don't match up—one peaks sooner than the other, and then both show second, non-matching peaks. Watson uses the sketch to pose a straightforward question: Do the two add together, cancel each other out, or interact in some other fashion? This opens the door to an incredibly complex problem.

Watson's results are based on work within a single cell line, testing one xenoestrogen at a time. Even so they seem to show an incredible range of effects. What happens at the tissue level, or at the level of a whole organism that might be exposed at any stage of development? For that matter, what happens to a human—a developing fetus, a newborn baby, a child, an adolescent, an adult—exposed, as we all to some degree have been, to multiple xenoestrogens at the same time?

"That's a really important question," Watson says. "We're at the point of depicting these mechanisms that each compound elicits in a dose and time-dependent way. But when you put them all together, which is undoubtedly how we see them—we know these things are in combinations in the environment—God only knows what these things do together. I think that needs to be studied. We're really only at the beginning of this."

Thanks for your time ,and please address our questions,

D/M

On Thu, Dec 15, 2011 at 11:55 AM, Eron king (b) (6) wrote:

I actually had to walk away from the computer due to being so emotionally disturbed by your response. I have my own responses below... I have lost a lot of confidence in this study.

I have a video of Dr. Barr. You will hear her talk of Big Chemical trying to influence what was done at CDC while she worked there.

-Eron

On Dec 15, 2011, at 10:53 AM, Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Hello Eron,
>
> Thank you for your questions.
>
> I understand and appreciate your concerns over having unwanted chemicals
> in the bodies of you and your children. There are powerful emotions
> involved on all sides of this issue and none of us want to minimize
> anyone's concerns. I also do not want toxic chemicals in my body or
> those of my family. The fact is that we live in an industrial society
> that has allowed the dumping of wastes into the environment for
> centuries, and those chemicals are everywhere.

THIS IS AN EXCUSE, ONE THAT I THOUGHT YOU WERE ABOVE.

> If we look, we will find
> chemicals in our bodies. I work with communities in the remote regions

> of the arctic, who are finding that they have levels of PCBs, and other
> persistent organic pollutants, coming from thousands of miles away, at
> concentrations in their food and bodies much higher than the general
> population. Because of the presence of so many chemicals in the
> environment and our bodies, one of the first tools we utilize in
> evaluating data results in specific populations is a comparison to the
> general population.
MY POINT WAS THAT YOU CHANGED THE MOTIVE OF THIS STUDY!!

> Not because we approve of the existence of those
> chemicals in the body, but because this comparison allows us to take
> into account the multitude of exposure sources that most people in
> western society have (e.g. clothing, building materials, store bought
> food, consumer products, electronics, furniture, transportation etc.).
> We need to be able to identify and address additional exposures that are
> resulting from unique community situations, which in this case are
> nearby pesticide applications.
NOW YOU HAVE YOUR PROOF... POSITIVE FOR 2,4-D.
> We will be performing a more health
> based evaluation of the results in our upcoming Exposure Investigation
> and Public Health Assessment documents.
>
> Those of us at ATSDR and OHA and other public health and environmental
> regulatory agencies across the country are doing what we can to identify
> and prevent exposures. Most of us are working in these agencies because
> we care about these issues and want to make a difference. I don't feel
> that I am allowing these exposures to occur. In the broadest sense,
> these exposures are occurring as a result of the social and cultural
> values held by the majority of citizens in western society, and economic
> conditions under which our present world is defined.
THIS IS OUTRIGHT BULLSHIT. THESE EXPOSURES ARE BECAUSE BIG TIMBER AND CHEMICAL HAVE THEIR CLAWS IN THE U.S. GOVERNMENT AND NO ONE WANTS TO STAND UP AND STOP IT!!!! YOU ALL MIGHT CARE, BUT WHO IS GOING TO STAND UP AND STOP THIS POISONING OF OUR CHILDREN...WHO?? YOU, RICHARD KAUFFMAN? HOW ABOUT YOU JAE DOUGLAS..?
YOU ALL HAVE AUTHORITY IN ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, STAND UP AND FIGHT FOR WHAT IS RIGHT. DON'T TELL ME TIMBER ISN'T INFLUENCING WHAT IS GOING ON HERE!!
> We want to sample
> the urine of residents in your area this spring to develop
> scientifically valid data which can be used by the public health and
> regulatory agencies to reduce exposures and improve the quality of life
> for everyone in the community.
ONLY AFTER ALLOWING THEM TO POISON OUR CHILDREN AGAIN! HOW CAN THAT BE CONSTITUTIONALLY LEGAL??

> All of us are committed to improving the
> conditions of the populations we serve, but we need to follow the
> "rules" of the system we live in,
WHAT RULES ARE BIG TIMBER GOING BY...? THEY SEEM TO GO AROUND THE RULES ALL THE TIME AND NO ONE STOPS THEM!!!!!!!
> and work under the authorities granted
> to us by the political and economic system that defines conditions in
> this country.
CHANGE THE RULES!!!!!! MAKE A DECISION, MAKE THE CALL, ARE YOU ALL AFRAID OF LOSING YOUR JOBS, CAUSE IF THAT'S THE CASE, THEN THERE IS INFLUENCE.
> Since our system does not operate under the precautionary
> principle, strong scientifically defensible information is needed to
> affect change.
THERE IS PLENTY OF SCIENTIFICALLY DEFENSIBLE INFORMATION OUT THERE... YOU ALL CHOOSE TO IGNORE IT!!!!!!!!
SEARCH YOUR HEART FOR WHAT IS RIGHT, WE ONLY NEED SO MANY PEOPLE TO STAND UP. WHEN THEY SEE YOUR STRENGTH, THEY TOO WILL STAND UP FOR WHAT'S RIGHT.
WE ARE LARGER THAN THAN THE TIMBER INDUSTRY, AND YOU ALL KNOW THINGS NEED TO CHANGE.

>
> In regards to your Atrazine results:
>
> Table 7 indicates that only ATSDR and OHA will have access to the urine
> "raw data".
>
> It is not clear to me what you are looking for in regards to "raw data",
> but the only thing ATSDR and OHA have in our possession for Atrazine is
> an excel spreadsheet which includes:
> "samplename" (unique identifier/sample number),
> "analytename" (e.g. Atrazine mercapturate),
> "finalamount" (e.g.. <LTSD),
> "comment" (e.g. Code 5 (Turbid),<LSTD(0.0615)),
> analytecode (e.g. "ATZ" for Atrazine mercapturate), and
> "date" (that the sample was analyzed).
> This is the "raw data" that we have.
>
> No traces of Atrazine under the level of detection are provided for any
> sample in the data table, so it is not possible for Ken to have told
> anyone that there was. There were some 2,4-D results reported under the
> level of detection in the 2,4-D spreadsheet, so it is possible that the
> other participant heard this about his 2,4-D results and presumed that
> the same was true for Atrazine. As far as I know, you have in your

> possession all the data available for your urine sample and those of
> your children who were tested..
>
> I hope this has been helpful.
>
> Regards,
>
> Richard
>
>
> CAPT Richard R. Kauffman, M.S.
> Senior Regional Representative
> Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry
> 1200 6th Ave., ATS-197
> Seattle, WA 98101
> Cell (b) (6)
> Office (206) 553-2632
> www.atsdr.cdc.gov
> fax (206) 553-2142
> RKauffman@cdc.gov
>
>
>
> From: Eron king (b) (6)
> To: Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> Cc: "esseneinfo@aol.com Owen" <esseneinfo@aol.com>, Clare Howard
> (b) (6) Marijana Gee
> (b) (6) ffeldstein@cdc.gov,
> "jae.p.douglas@state.or.us DOUGLAS"
> <jae.p.douglas@state.or.us>, "keo1@cdc.gov
> (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB) Orloff" <keo1@cdc.gov>, Elizabeth
> Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Hale (b) (6),
> BISHOP Karen <karen.bishop@state.or.us>
> Date: 12/14/2011 08:41 PM
> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, NOW QUESTIONS FROM ERON
>
>
>
> Hello All,
> I feel because I have been privy to your conversations I can express a
> few
> questions here. First however, thank you Capt. Kauffman for answering
> many
> questions we all have out here. You have been very patient and
> educational.
> I want to start by pointing to that same table that you mention below on

> page
> 7 of the protocol document. On that table it states that several
> agencies will
> receive access to the raw data. I too would like to see my families raw
> data. I was told in an earlier email that there was no other "raw data".
> In a
> conversation with another participant in the study, I found out that in
> his
> phone call to Orloff he was told that he had traces of atrazine in his
> system,
> but it was under the level of detection, therefore not shown on our lab
> analysis we received in the mail. I want to know my numbers, I have
> children
> that are positive for these poisons, and you can't tell me that isn't
> interfering
> with their developing bodies. I care, even if their numbers are below
> the level of detection.
> And surely I am also privy to my children's own medical information.
> Also you stated on page 3 (and several other pages) of that same
> protocol
> that "the data will be specific to participants in the investigation,
> and are not intended to be generalized to the wider community or other
> populations". However in our letters we received, on the bottom of the
> first page
> after (1) it compares us to averages in the NHANES study,
> and states that our test results are "within the typical range of
> exposure.
> What is the typical range of exposure for a 6 year old? Can you point me
> to a study
> assuring me that both my 6 and 11 year olds will not suffer any health
> affects when
> they are my age! Actually you state several times throughout the
> document how you will be comparing our data to other data sets, some
> that aren't
> even health based, rather population based. You are contradicting
> yourselves I feel.
> On the second page of the letter we received it states that "Atrazine
> and
> it's breakdown products were not detected in your urine sample". After
> such contradictions, and information through other participants
> concerning
> atrazine levels, I would like to see that raw data. I was told through
> other
> professionals that we have a right to this information. Can you tell me
> what
> I and others can do to access that information?

> Another thing that troubles me and several others is the fact that we
> now know
> (again for some) that we are getting exposed to 2,4-D, and maybe even
> atrazine, just
> below the level of detection. What do you say you are going to do
> now....? You
> tell us that you will come in and sample in the spring, gathering data
> after the sprays.
> The problem with that you see, is we are now supposed to accept that you
> are
> letting them poison our children again so that you can collect your
> data.
> After finding that we all, or most of us have been poisoned, shouldn't
> there be a mandate issued stopping all spray until the pathway of
> exposure is revealed? Why continue the poisoning of our children?
> Wouldn't every single one of you be a little more than troubled that
> your still
> developing children are being exposed to chemicals on a regular basis???
> Thank you all for your time and help on this delicate issue, we
> appreciate it
> greatly.
>
> Eron King
>
>
>
> On Dec 14, 2011, at 12:25 PM, Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>
>> Good morning Day,
>>
>> I apologize for my delayed response, but was out of the office
>> yesterday.
>>
>> If you had asked me your question at the open house on November 18th,
> I
>> would have told you that the upcoming Exposure Investigation report on
>> the urine results will be authored by ATSDR in cooperation with OHA.
>> This is also clearly stated in the Protocol available at the OHA
>> website. This protocol document also describes the fact that some of
>> the environmental samples would be analyzed by the ODA lab (Table 2,
>> page 7, and 2nd to last paragraph on page 8) and these results
> QA/QC'd
>> by EPA to ensure the integrity of the results (attachment B, Section D
>> starting at page 16). I will leave it to EPA to describe why they are
>> confident that the ODA laboratory generated data will be valid and
>> useable.

>>
>> In response to your questions below:
>>
>> 1) The primary author of the report is Ken Orloff, ATSDR with
> co-authors
>> David Farrer, Sujata Joshi, Jae Douglas, & Karen Bishop of OHA. I am
> a
>> reviewer of the document along with several others in the ATSDR
>> headquarters office, including Ken's supervisor Susan Moore of the
>> Exposure Investigation & Site Assessments Branch, Rick Gillig and
> Audra
>> Henry of the Cooperative Agreement & Program Evaluation Branch,
>> personnel from ATSDR's Office of Science, and likely others in the
> chain
>> of command at ATSDR/NCEH including one or more Division Directors.
>>
>> 2) CDC has a world-wide reputation for integrity and is considered the
>> world's leading scientific public health institution. While I cannot
>> say that CDC is impervious to political influence, I see no signs that
>> industry is exerting any influence on the work ATSDR/CDC is performing
>> in the Highway 36/Triangle Lake investigations.
>>
>> 3) I have limited familiarity with Oregon's Right to Farm and Forest
>> Laws, and cannot speak to their potential influence on PARC's role in
>> these investigations, however, these laws have no influence over the
>> work of ATSDR and EPA, and I see no evidence of any negative influence
>> on the work being performed by the above mentioned OHA staff, of which
>> all are or were working in positions at OHA funded by ATSDR under our
>> Cooperative Agreement Program.
>>
>> We care about the health of everyone in the community, and are working
>> hard to insure that the results of our investigations are accurate,
>> scientifically defensible, and help us answer concerns about exposures
>> to pesticides in the Highway 36/Triangle Lake area.
>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Richard
>>
>> CAPT Richard R. Kauffman, M.S.
>> Senior Regional Representative
>> Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry
>> 1200 6th Ave., ATS-197
>> Seattle, WA 98101
>> Cell (b) (6)
>> Office (206) 553-2632

>> www.atsdr.cdc.gov
>> fax (206) 553-2142
>> RKauffman@cdc.gov
>>
>>
>>
>> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
>> To: Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
>> Cc: (b) (6)
>> (b) (6), jae.p.douglas@state.or.us,
> keo1@cdc.gov,
>> ffeldstein@cdc.gov
>> Date: 12/12/2011 05:07 PM
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria,
> IL
>>
>>
>>
>> Richard and all:
>> I must be blunt: At the public meeting put on by PARC recently at
>> Triangle Lake School, I was told -- by more than one agency rep at the
>> meeting -- that it was you who would be writing that March report; it
>> was that assurance that caused me to feel pretty good about the
> chances
>> that Triangle Lake pesticide exposure victims would finally get an
>> honest, 'best science' study, so long deserved. Now, coming on the
> heels
>> of the stunning revelation that the physical samples taken by the
>> federal EPA were not given to a lab affiliated with the EPA or
> analyzed
>> by EPA scientists, but instead were immediately put into the hands of
>> the Oregon Department of Agriculture and their lab. The problem with
>> that should be obvious: That lab cannot possibly be considered
> unbiased
>> in this matter, nor can the Oregon Department of Agriculture, being
>> under such heavy influence of the pesticide makers like Dow and
> Monsanto
>> via Oregonians for Food and Shelter and similar industry groups. But
>> rather than argue the merit of that lab, let me point out what I want
> to
>> be blunt about: THERE SEEMS TO BE A BIT OF "SMOKE AND SCREENS" going
> on,
>> an attempt to hide the fact that the fox is investigating the loss of
>> eggs in the hen-house! To be really blunt: Putting the Pesticide
>> Division of the Oregon Department of Agriculture -- whose very mission
>> statement includes a clause about maintaining the availability of

>> pesticides -- in charge of the physical evidence collected by the EPA
> is
>> ludicrous! Thus, I hereby make several official requests of you,
>> Captain Richard Kauffman of the Agency for Toxic Substances and
> Disease
>> Registry (ATSDR is part of CDC and works with EPA).
>>
>> Specific Official Requests:
>>
>> 1) Can you -- and will you -- now provide me with the names and agency
>> affiliations of each author of specific sections of the report on the
>> pesticide investigation due out in March? If so, please include
> contact
>> information for them.
>>
>> 2) I trust you, Captain Kauffman, but I know little of your parent
>> agency, the CDC (Center for Disease Control), and thus bluntly ask: In
>> your honest opinion, since CDC is headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia,
> and
>> since there is a strong timber lobbying group in that region, is it
>> possible that the same multinational corporations that are literally
>> 'pulling the strings' in Oregon are capable of applying pressure on
> the
>> CDC headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia? If so, have you seen any signs
> or
>> felt any pressures from Atlanta that you are comfortable sharing with
>> us?
>>
>> 3) Have you read the eight or so statutes collectively called 'The
>> Oregon Right to Farm and Forest Laws? If so, do you feel that those
> laws
>> affect in a negative or positive way the investigation of Triangle
> Lake
>> pesticide exposures by PARC?
>>
>> Thanks, Richard, and one more thing: I am still working on assembling
>> one or more scientists/experts to interface with you and other agency
>> reps per our previous communication on that topic.
>>
>> -- Day Owen, on behalf of myself and a number of other community
> members
>> concerned about the health and well-being of our children.
>>
>>
>>
>>

>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Kauffman.Richard <Kauffman.Richard@epamail.epa.gov>
>> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
>> Cc: clarehoward[redacted]; danandmaya
>>[redacted] spiralmom[redacted]; jae.p.douglas
>> <jae.p.douglas@state.or.us>; keo1 <keo1@cdc.gov>; ffeldstein
>> <ffeldstein@cdc.gov>
>> Sent: Mon, Dec 12, 2011 6:01 am
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> Hello Day, et. al.
>>
>> This is an excellent question, and one we are working to address as we
>> develop our protocol for spring sampling. It is our intent to be as
>> timely as possible in collecting post-spray samples. The details
> still
>> need to be worked out.
>>
>> One clarification: I am part of a team including ATSDR headquarters
>> staff and OHA staff which is developing the exposure investigation
>> report. Most of the actual report writing is being done by others.
>>
>> Regards,
>>
>> Richard
>>
>> CAPT Richard R. Kauffman, M.S.
>> Senior Regional Representative
>> Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry
>> 1200 6th Ave., ATS-197
>> Seattle, WA 98101
>> Cell[redacted]
>> Office (206) 553-2632
>> www.atsdr.cdc.gov
>> fax (206) 553-2142
>> RKauffman@cdc.gov
>>
>>
>>
>> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
>> To: [redacted]
>> [redacted] Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
>> Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
>> Date: 12/09/2011 03:08 PM
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist
> from Peoria,

>> IL
>>
>>
>>
>> In response to your question, Clare: About 66 people from
>> thirty-something households. Just got our results. All I can say right
>> now is that lots of people I have talked to are showing up positive
> this
>> time for 2,4-D but not atrazine, including my wife, Neila. That
> actually
>> strengthens our position with the investigating scientists in that it
>> was known that atrazine was not sprayed this fall around the time of
>> their testing, but 2,4-D was. In Neila's case, her current reading on
>> 2,4-D is way higher than her previous level with Dr Barr's test. Now,
>> what the scientists will do -- they have told me -- is to watch and
> see
>> if, the next time atrazine is sprayed and they go in and test quickly
>> afterward, if we who are now negative in our current baseline samples
>> are then positive for atrazine: BINGO!
>>
>> In the above paragraph the clause that is the key is: "they go in and
>> test quickly afterward".
>> If their process and methodology is set-up to do a quick response to
>> news that a spray that may involve atrazine is going to take place,
> then
>> they will likely find atrazine above whatever they have now found in
> the
>> August baseline sample.
>>
>> I have included in the recipients of this email one of the most
>> significant government agency reps involved with the current study,
>> Captain Richard Kauffman of CDC.
>> It is Richard that will write the official government report linked to
>> the recent OHA-led urine tests. RICHARD, for the benefit of Clare, a
>> freelance reporter who is interested in this current investigation and
>> recently visited my home researching an atrazine-related article, can
>> you respond to the comments I made in the two above paragraphs,
>> especially speaking to the question raised in paragraph two above:
> Will
>> the process and methodology of the investigative team be able to make
>> quick tactical decisions to respond to where atrazine may be sprayed
> in
>> the spring? And if so, do you intend to do that? -- Day Owen
>>
>>
>>

>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Clare Howard (b) (6)
>> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
>> Sent: Thu, Dec 8, 2011 11:37 pm
>> Subject: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> Dear Day,
>> I hope you and Neila are doing well. Good to hear from you. Did you
> and
>> Neila get your results yet? Who is paying for this round of urinalysis
>> testing and how many people participated this time?
>> My editor is currently in discussions with The New York Times.
>> Yes, I will send the email again listing contacts. I have an
> additional
>> contact as well. When will you schedule the teleconference? Can I
>> listen in on the call?
>> Best regards,
>> Clare
>>
>> From: esseneinfo@aol.com
>> Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 6:22 PM
>> To (b) (6)
>> Subject: Re: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> HI Clare!
>> Although individuals will get their urine test results by mail durring
>> December, the commulative results -- which is what we would need to
>> really say anything about it -- wont be available until March.
>> Do you yet know what publication your editor is at first going to try
>> for?
>> The book idea is great!
>> GOOD NEWS: The government folks doing the testing have agree to my
>> request to hold a teleconference with whatever experts I wish to
>> provide.
>> Could you please reply to this email with the names and contact info
> of
>> several possible experts again? I can't find that previous email from
>> you and fear that it was deleted.
>> Blessings, Day
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Clare Howard (b) (6)
>> To: esseneinfo <esseneinfo@aol.com>
>> Sent: Wed, Dec 7, 2011 4:13 am

>> Subject: Note from Clare Howard, journalist from Peoria, IL
>>
>> Dear Day,
>>
>> Hope you and Neila are doing well.
>>
>> My material has been through the first edit and I'm waiting to hear
>> back. This waiting is difficult.
>>
>> Do you know when the results of the follow-up urinalysis testing will
> be
>> released. Could you let me know the results. You would be interested
>> that a researcher I quote in my article said she expects if urinalysis
>> testing were done in the Midwest, we'd have the same or higher
> results.
>> A scientist in the European Union talked to me about the history
> behind
>> the EU ban and said ultimately, scientists concluded atrazine couldn't
>> safely be used even under ideal conditions following label directions.
>>
>> I will get my article to you as soon as it's published and I hope you
>> will find it useful.
>>
>> My best,
>>
>> Clare
>>
>> PS: My editor suggested turning the article into a book. I'd love to
> do
>> that and will look for possible funding sources.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>
>
>